



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,915	06/21/2006	Roland Huttinger	P40110US	5072
83956	7590	04/06/2009		
Vicring, Jentschura & Partner - OSR 3770 Highland Ave. Suite 203 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266				
				EXAMINER PERRY, ANTHONY T
				ART UNIT 2879
				PAPER NUMBER ELECTRONIC
		NOTIFICATION DATE 04/06/2009		
		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vjp-us@vjp.de  
cfrerking@vjp.de  
patint@vjp.de

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/583,915	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HUTTINGER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> ANTHONY T. PERRY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/96/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/09/07

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Objections***

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: Both claims appear to have limitations within parenthesis. Recitations enclosed by parenthesis are not considered part of the claim limitations. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "in particular" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claims 2-15 are dependent from claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons given above.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the pin" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the plurality of holes" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the plurality of holes" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "D" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the tip" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the ratio of A/D" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation D in the claim.

Regarding claim 15, the phrase "in particular" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the laser beam" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the rate of repetition" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the energy density" in lines 2-3 (twice). There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the material" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eggers (US 6,437,509).

Regarding claim 1, Eggers discloses an electrode for metal vapor-containing discharge lamps made from a high-melting, electrically conductive material (col. 1, line 43) comprising a shaft (13) and a pin-shaped head part (17), which defines a longitudinal axis, characterized in that at least one hole (20,20') is arranged essentially transversely with respect to the longitudinal axis, at an angle of 60 to 90 degrees with respect to the longitudinal axis, in the region of the head part (17) (for example, see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 3, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the head part (17) has a diameter D2 which extends beyond that of the shaft (13) (for example, see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 4, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the hole (20) is continuous or is in the form of a blind hole (for example, see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 5, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the head part contains at most three holes (for example, see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 6, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the diameter of the hole varies, the hole (20) having a maximum diameter B (for example, see Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 7, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 6, characterized in that the maximum diameter is in each case approximately the same size in the case of a plurality of holes (20, 20') (see Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 8, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the hole is linear (for example, see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 9, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the plurality of holes (20,20') lie in one plane (see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 10, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 9, characterized in that the plurality of holes are connected to one another (see Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 11, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 4, wherein the hole is continuous. It is noted that claim 11 does not require that a blind hole be formed, since it is dependent on claim 4 which states that "the hole is continuous or is in the form of a blind hole", and therefor the recitation, "that each blind hole has a depth of at least 50% of the diameter of the head part" is not necessary if the hole is continuous.

Regarding claim 13, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the distance between the center of the hole (20) and the tip is denoted by A, the ratio A to the diameter of head part is within a range between 1 and 6 (for example, see Fig. 9).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers (US 6,437,509).

Regarding claim 2, Eggers does not specifically disclose an embodiment wherein the shaft and the head part have a uniform, predetermined diameter. However, it is noted that such configurations of lamp discharge electrodes are known in the art. Also, it is noted that the applicant's specific limitation of the shaft and the head part does not solve any of the stated problems or yield any unexpected result that is not within the scope of the teachings applied. Therefore it is considered to be a matter of choice, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious to select any configuration (same diameters or a larger diameter for the head of the electrode), based on the constraints of the lamp being manufactured and the desired discharge properties, as long as the electrode head has transverse holes provided therein.

Regarding claim 14, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically recite that the ratio between the diameter of the hole and the diameter of the head part is between 0.05 and 0.3. However, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an appropriate ratio for the diameter of the hole to the diameter of the head portion of the electrode, since optimization of workable ranges is considered within the skill of the art. It would be obvious that the diameter of the hole should be considerably less than the diameter of the head part of the electrode so as not break the head portion of the electrode when providing the hole.

Regarding claim 15, Eggers teaches a lamp having at least one electrode as claimed in claim 1, wherein the discharge vessel is made of glass or ceramic. Eggers does not specifically recite the fill material of the lamp. However, it is well known in the art to use mercury and/or

sodium as the fill material in discharge lamps. It has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to have used mercury and/or sodium as the gas fill of the discharge lamp taught by Eggers, since the selection of known materials for a known purpose is within the skill of the art.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers (US 6,437,509) in view of Neiger et al. (US 4,937,496).

Regarding claim 12, Eggers teaches the electrode as claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically recite that the tip of the head part is rounded off.

However, Neiger et al. teach an electrode of a discharge lamp having the tip of the head part is rounded off (for example, see col. 2, line 65 – col. 3, line 1). Neiger teaches that by rounding off the tip portion of the head of the electrode, it prevents disintegration and melting of the electrode tip. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to round off the tip of the electrode taught by Eggers in order to prevent disintegration and melting of the tip of the electrode, and thereby increasing the lifetime of the lamp.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers (US 6,437,509) in view of Makoto (JP 11-123577).

Regarding claim 16, Eggers teaches a method for producing an electrode, in which the electrode has a pin-shaped head part having a longitudinal axis, characterized in that a hole (20) is produced essentially transversely with respect to the longitudinal axis using a laser (for example, see col. 1, lines 44-61 and Fig. 9). Eggers does not specifically recite that the hole is made by short laser pulses of a maximum of 10 microseconds in duration.

However, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known method on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Furthermore, Makoto teaches a method of forming holes into an article, that uses short laser pulses of a maximum of 10 microseconds in duration (for example, see the abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to have looked to the Makoto reference for guidance in operating the laser to form the holes, since Eggers remains silent about the specifics on how the laser is used to form the holes.

Regarding claim 17, Makoto teaches the the laser beam is focused (for example, see abstract and Fig. 1).

Same reasoning for combination, above, applies.

Regarding claim 18, Makoto teaches that the rate of repetition of the pulses is at least 1 kHz (for example, see the abstract).

Same reasoning for combination, above, applies.

Regarding claim 19, Eggers and Makoto do not specifically recite that that the energy density of the focused laser beam is above the energy density required for sublimation of the material of the electrode. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have ensured that the energy density of the focused laser beam is above the energy density required for sublimation of the material of the electrode. Otherwise, it would not be possible to form the holes with such accuracy.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Anthony Perry* whose telephone number is (571) 272-2459. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 9:00AM to 5:30PM Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. **The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anthony Perry/

Anthony Perry  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2879

/NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2879